



## HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

*ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL Historic District*

3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

---

*Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning*

www.howardcountymd.gov

VOICE 410-313-2350

FAX 410-313-3042

### March Agenda

Thursday, March 3, 2016; 7:00 p.m.

---

The March meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission will be held at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043. All cases are public meetings unless otherwise indicated. All inquiries should be made to: 410-313-2350. Requests for accommodations need to be made three working days in advance of the meeting. Materials are available in alternative formats upon request.

---

**\*\*Please note the following comments and recommendations are from DPZ Staff and are recommendations for the Commission to consider, they do not represent a decision made by the Commission. \*\***

#### **PLANS FOR APPROVAL**

1. 15-47c – 3578 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City
2. 16-07 – 8081 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 16-08 – 8505-8507 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. 16-06 – 3538 Church Road, Ellicott City (continued from February)

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

##### **15-47c – 3578 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City**

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: James and Susan Hade

**Background & Scope of Work:** The Applicant was pre-approved for tax credits on August 6, 2015 to make several exterior repairs, to include:

- 1) Repair structural issues and drainage of porch foundation.
- 2) Replace wood porch with tongue and groove hardwood.
- 3) Replace all gutters with new aluminum K-style or half round gutters.
- 4) Replace trim and fascia with all primed and painted wood fascia, rake and trim boards.
- 5) Install primed and painted wood or smooth Hardie board for soffits.
- 6) Replace drip edge with pressure treated wood with a beveled edge.

The Applicant seeks \$1,350.00 in final tax credits for the expense of the replacement of the gutters and the painting of the woodwork which cost \$5,400.00. The other items have not yet been done.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approve and the paid invoices add up to the requested amount.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends final tax credit approval of \$1,350.00 as submitted.

## REGULAR AGENDA

### **16-07 – 8081 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Courtney Kehoe

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. The Applicant seeks approval to replace rotten wood lap siding on the back side of the building with LP Smart Guard engineered wood siding. The siding will be painted Benjamin Moore Raleigh Tan to match the existing.

**Staff Comments:** Chapter 6.D of the Guidelines recommends, “maintain, repair and protect wood siding, wood shingles or log construction” and “when necessary, replace deteriorated wood siding or shingles with wood siding or shingles that match the original as closely as possible in width, shape, and profile. Maintain the original shape and width of details such as cornerboards, cornices, and door and window trim.” Therefore Staff recommends the siding be replaced with wood siding to match the existing. It may be possible that some of the existing siding can be salvaged and not replaced entirely. This work would be eligible for historic tax credits.

The Guidelines also state, “if wood siding must be replaced on a historic building, a composite siding material may be considered, if wood is not a viable option, the composite siding conveys the appearance of the historic material, and application of the substitute material does not damage or obscure historic features. The texture, width, shape, profile and finish of the substitute siding material should be similar to the wood siding it replaces.” If there is a reason that wood siding is not a viable option, Staff finds the engineered wood would be an acceptable option as it is a wood product and is quite durable.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the rotten wood siding be replaced with new wood siding to match the existing. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.

### **16-08 –8505-8507 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Troy Samuels

**Background & Scope of Work:** This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District and is in the process of being constructed. The previous owner received approval to demolish the house in February 2011, which expired before the demolition took place. In July 2014 the previous owner came back to the Commission for approval to demolish the house again in order to sell the property to the current Applicants.

#### Case History

In October 2010 the Applicant first presented plans to the Commission to demolish the historic duplex and build a duplex in its place. The Commission was not satisfied with the design of the new construction and some questioned whether the historic house should remain. The Commission voted to continue the meeting until February 2011 to allow the Applicant time to explore other options. At the February 2011 meeting the Commission approved the demolition of the historic home and the construction of a new single family home in its place. The Applicant returned in August 2011 with modified plans to construct a two-story single family house, with full attic and exposed ground level basement. Staff was concerned the two-story house, with full attic and exposed ground level basement

was out of character with the neighborhood. The Commission agreed that the proposed house was out of character, giving the appearance of a 4-story building. The Commission approved the application with the following changes:

The house will be changed from the current proposal back to the original approved drawing of the 2,000 square foot front façade. The first floor elevation of the new structure is going to be no more than one foot higher than the doorsill of the house to the right. The roof eave fascia should be within one foot of the fascia of the house to the right [west]. The roof pitch will be adjusted to attempt to have the ridge line below the neighboring house; if the line is slightly higher it will be allowed, but no more than one foot higher. The items on the material list are approved with changes to the windows, doors, siding, and lighting:

- 1) The windows will have 3-4" of exterior trim added to both the front and sides.
- 2) The siding will be changed to a 5" exposure.
- 3) The doors will be standard wooden doors.
- 4) There will just be one light mounted at the entrance.
- 5) All other items will remain the same with no changes.

The gutters should be half-round or K style white aluminum. The columns will be square and plain white. The railings will be standard colonial. The dormers will be switched to the back. The final permit drawings will be brought back to Staff for review of the elevations of the floor, eave, and roof line, and is subject to approval per the Commission's recommendations. The drawings will show the elevations on the house next door so that Staff can see how everything lines up.

In January 2012 the Applicant returned to the Commission with two new proposals; the first showed a side elevation of the house at the first floor elevation as approved in August. The second proposal showed a side elevation of the house at a higher elevation than was approved in August. The Applicant preferred to build at the higher elevation, which would have resulted in changes to the front elevation of the new house. The Commission indicated they would not approve the house at the higher elevation and the Applicant withdrew the proposal.

In March 2012 the Applicant submitted new plans and proposed constructing a 3-story duplex house with a mansard roof. The first floor of the house will serve as the basement level and be constructed into the hillside. The current proposed house will have a first floor elevation of 230.8 feet. The neighboring house has a first floor elevation of 230.6 feet. The roof peak elevation on the proposed house will be 260.1 feet and the neighboring house has a roof peak elevation of 258.3 feet, so the new house will be 1.8 feet higher than the neighboring house.

The Commission approved this application with the following motion:

Mr. Hauser moved to Approve per the Staff recommendation, except for #4 regarding the use of real stone. Instead of real stone, a faux stone may be used on the sides of the house on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor exposed walls. The stone needs to be brought in to Staff for their approval, but if siding is used it does not need to be approved by Staff. Trim is to be added on the front façade windows and doors. The side windows are to be lined up. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

In July 2014 the demolition of the house was approved again.

#### Current Application

In an earlier application for the construction of the house, submitted by the previous owner, the Commission stipulated that construction drawings should be submitted to Staff at the time they were submitted to the Department of Inspections, Licenses and Permits (DILP). Those drawings were not submitted to Staff, although Staff has now reviewed the drawings with DILP during the writing of this staff report. Staff emailed the Applicant, requesting those drawings be submitted in order for the Commission to understand the design of the house and the current application. The Applicant submitted the drawings the following day, on February 24, 2016.

### **Roof Height**

Staff sent the Applicant a letter in December 2015 notifying them that the construction did not appear to be in compliance with the plans that were approved as the building appears taller than approved. The Applicant has provided the following statement regarding the height:

“The height of the structure is 31 feet, 33 .5 feet including parapet wall which is required by code. The neighboring houses with flat roofs were built before this code was in place, which places us within the 34 foot height requirement which other houses on the street are not over 34 feet.”

### **Windows**

The Applicant now seeks approval to change the windows from the Andersen Narroline to Jeld-Wen 2500 series, 1:1 wood window. The color will remain white.

### **Front Door**

The Applicant proposes to change the front door from a Jeld-Wen 6 panel wood door to a Jeld-Wen 3 lite over 3 panel wood door.

### **Mansard Roof**

The Applicant proposes to cover the mansard roof using GAF Timberline HD asphalt shingles in the color Weathered Wood. The application states that HardiePlank was originally approved, however that is incorrect; the mansard roof was originally to be shingled in oxford grey asphalt shingles.

### **Patio Door**

There are spec sheets without photographs for a Jeld-Wen sliding patio door, but no other reference in the application.

### **Stone**

There is a spec sheet for stone, but there are no photos regarding the use of the material.

### **Staff Comments:**

#### **Roof Height**

When this application was first approved, there was a lot of discussion and concern over the height of the building compared to the neighboring structures. The Applicant has included language from the Zoning Regulations explaining the height; however 34 feet is the maximum height that a principal structure can be, not a minimum. The current height does not comply with the previous approval or with Chapter 8.B recommendations, “design new buildings so that the floor to ceiling height and the heights of cornices and eaves are similar to or blend with nearby buildings. Generally, there should not be more than a 10 percent difference in height between a new building and neighboring buildings if the neighboring buildings are similar in height.” The new structure appears to be more than 10 percent higher than the neighboring mansard roof building. The Guidelines also recommend, “design new

buildings to be compatible with neighboring buildings in bulk, ratio of height to width and the arrangement of door and window openings.” The dormer windows are higher than the neighboring building, but more so is the height above the dormer windows. The proportions are not correct; the parapet wall should not be that much higher than the windows or change pitch. The mansard roof as shown in the construction drawings and as constructed has a slight pitch backwards and with a parapet wall that extends straight up above it, which is not correct construction for a mansard roof design. The design that was approved did not show this imbalance in proportions nor the design flaw in the pitch of the mansard roof and parapet wall. The current building has deviated from the HPC approved plans.

### **Windows**

Staff has no objection over the change to the Jeld-Wen w2500 series window from the Andersen Narroline. The window will remain wood, which complies with the Guidelines, “use materials common to the historic district, such as wood siding, wood shingles, brick, stone or stucco, and compatible with materials used in the immediate vicinity.”

### **Front Doors**

The front door that has been submitted is a craftsman style door, which is not the style of the house. Chapter 8.B recommends, “use elements such as porch shapes, window or door openings...and other characteristics that echo historic Ellicott City buildings.” There are no craftsman style homes in the immediate vicinity. The originally approved 6-panel door is the most architecturally appropriate door for the style of the house. Chapter 6.G of the Guidelines explains, “historically, most Ellicott City doors were painted, paneled wood. Six-panel and eight-panel doors were used during the early period.” Staff understands a door with windows is desired and recommends the Applicant consider a different style of glass and paneled door, as recommended by Chapter 6.G of the Guidelines.

Staff just received a copy of the plans that were submitted to DILP and they show the doors located on the left side of each duplex unit, so the front of the building reads “door, window, door, window.” Per the Decision and Order for HPC-12-07, the doors were supposed to be paired in the center of the building as recommended by Staff and supported by the Commission.

### **Mansard Roof**

There appears to be some confusion over the original material of the mansard roof, which was to be a Tamko asphalt shingle in the color Oxford Grey. The current Applicant proposes to use GAF Timberline asphalt shingles in the color Weathered Wood. The siding on the house will be HardiePlank siding in the color Navajo Beige. Staff is concerned the Weathered Wood shingle will be too monotone and not appropriate with the design of a mansard roof. The neighboring house also has a mansard roof and the siding and roof shingle is unpainted wood shingle. Staff recommends the roof be constructed with the Oxford Grey shingles as previously approved. Another brand may certainly be used, if samples of the shingle are provided and determined to be appropriate. Staff finds the Weathered Wood shingle will stand out as fake material next to the neighboring wood shingle roof and not blend in with the neighboring architecture. The neighboring houses are shown below.



### Patio Door

The application does not indicate where the patio door will be located, although it will most likely be on the rear of the house. Staff recommends the Applicant submit a future application with a spec sheet of the proposed patio door and pictures of the back of the house.

### Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends:

- 1) Denial of new height of building and new roof shingle color.
- 2) Approval of Jeld-Wen windows.

Staff recommends a different style of front door be used. The doors are not being constructed as approved and Staff recommends denial of the as-built location. Pending the Commission's decision, Staff will need to talk to DILP to determine the process moving forward.

### 16-06 – 3538 Church Lane, Ellicott City (continued from February)

Removal of trees.

Applicant: Stephanie Tuite

**Background & Scope of Work:** This application is being continued from the February 2016 meeting. On February 4, 2016 the Applicant came before the Commission for approval to construct two retaining walls and remove 146 trees. The Commission approved the construction of the retaining walls at that time, but the tree removal was continued to be heard at the March 2016 meeting. Three of the trees located along Church that were originally proposed to be removed were changed to remain after the December meeting.

The Applicant has submitted additional information regarding the proposed removal of trees. The additional information explains that the majority of the specimen trees proposed to be removed are Silver Maples, which can have a very intrusive root system that would impact paving and have been known to break through house foundation walls and sewer lines. The application states that the trees vary in condition from good to poor. The Applicant is looking into retaining two of the three Black Walnut trees on Lot 5 & 6, that are proposed to be removed and the application states that a plan to retain two of the three will be presented at the March meeting. John Canoles with Eco-Science Professional, Inc. is the environmental consultant and will be in attendance at the March meeting to discuss the condition of the trees.

The new information provides an assessment of the trees on the property, breaking down the number of trees found in certain diameter breast height (DBH) ranges and the approximate age of the tree. The majority of the trees on the property have an average DBH range of 13"-16.3" as shown in the chart to the right.

	All Trees	Trees to be Removed	Trees to be Retained
Total Trees	247	135	112
Average size dbh	16.2"	16.3"	16.3"
Median tree size dbh	15.5"	15.5"	15.5"
Most frequent dbh	13"	13"	12"
Range	12-29"	12-27.5"	12-29"
Most common species/% occurrence	Tulip poplar 69%	Tulip poplar 73%	Tulip poplar 66%
Estimated Age range (calculated by multiplying most frequent and average tree sizes by 3 - growth factor of poplar)	39-49 years	39-49 years	39-49 years
Non-native/landscaping trees	38	16	22
Trees rated poor/fair condition	29	21	8
Number of different species	22 includes 10 species of invasive or landscaping	20 includes 10 species of invasive or landscaping	13 includes 6 species of invasive or landscaping

The Applicant has also submitted photographs of the specimen trees that are proposed to be removed. Several of the trees appear to be in very poor condition, with obvious limb dieback, trunk rot, split trunks, and broken limbs.

**Staff Comments:** The photographs and report provided show that the removal of some of the trees would comply with Chapter 9.B recommendations, which recommends against “the removal of live mature trees, unless it is necessary due to disease or to prevent damage to historic structures” and that considers Routine Maintenance to be, “removing dead or certifiably diseased trees.” While these trees are living, they are very visibly nearing the end of their life cycle and appear in very poor condition. The Guidelines explain that “mature trees are important to Ellicott City...Some, such as the silver maple trees along upper Church Road (planted in 1888), are similar in age to nearby historic buildings. These and other trees that are tied to the history of the area should be carefully protected.” The three silver maple specimens that are located along Church Road will no longer be removed. However, there are other silver maples that are proposed to be removed located interior to the site and their conditions are documented in the report submitted.

Staff supports the current proposal to possibly save two of the walnut trees, which would comply with Chapter 9.B recommendations, “Retain landscaping patterns that reflect the historic development of the property. Use historic photographs or landscaping plans if these are available” and “Retain mature trees and shrubs. Provide for their replacement when necessary.” The majority of the specimen trees to be removed appears to be silver maple, but they do not all appear to be in good condition. The majority of the non-specimen trees to be removed appear to be tulip popular, but they are the younger of the trees to be removed as well.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends saving two of the black walnut trees as mentioned. Staff finds many of the silver maples that are to be removed are in poor condition and agrees that they should be removed.

\*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

---

Beth Burgess  
Executive Secretary